



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/525,330	02/23/2005	Naoya Yamaguchi	890050.523USPC	5092
500 7590 08/22/2008 SEED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP PLLC 701 FIFTH AVE SUITE 5400 SEATTLE, WA 98104				
EXAMINER ZHANG, FAN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2625				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/22/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/525,330

Applicant(s)

YAMAGUCHI ET AL.

Examiner

FAN ZHANG

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 February 2005.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 February 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-85/86)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 02/23/2005
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. **Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.**

In claim 10, a "computer program" is a functional descriptive material and a functional descriptive material per se is excluded from any of the four categories of a process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter. Therefore, the claim subject matter, "computer program" is not statutory regardless its claimed functional description since it cannot be realizable without being encoded within a computer readable medium. See MPEP 2106.01 (I).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 and 6-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato (US Pub: 2003/0009695) and in further view of Sashihara (US Pub: 2002/0157007).

Regarding claim 1, Sato teaches: A log-in method for a client server system constituted so as to display a predetermined log-in screen on a client computer [fig. 3: S110], the server being constituted so as to obtain identification data of the client computer in response to a connection request from the client computer [fig. 3: S104], judge based on the identification data of the client computer a network to which the client computer is connected [fig. 3: S104, p0074], display a first log-in screen on the client computer when it judges that the network to which the client computer is connected is a first network [fig. 3: S105, S110 p0075, p0066]. Sato displays a log-in screen when it is judged that IP address matches one of the stored addresses indicating an allowed network. Sato does not display a log-in screen when it is judged that the IP address does not match one of those pre-stored. In the same field of endeavor, Sashihara teaches: display a second log-in screen on the client computer when it judges that the network to which the client computer is connected is a second network [p0054, p0055, p0074, fig. 3: S7, A, fig. 4: S14, S15, S20, S21, S22]. Sashihara performs log-in authentication when source IP address is judged to be not match one of the pre-stored addresses in a network. Displaying a log-in for user verification whether or not source IP address belongs to a designated network has been well known and practiced in the art as prescribed by Sato and Sashihara respectively. Therefore, it would have been obvious for an ordinary skilled in the art to combine the teaching of the

two to allow user verification to be performed regardless the network a client computer connected to for tightening network access security purpose.

Regarding claim 6, the rationale applied to the rejection of claim 1 has been incorporated herein. Sato further teaches: A log-in method in accordance with claim 1, wherein the server is constituted so as to refer to a list in which at least the identification data of the client computer connected to the second network is registered when it judges a network the client computer is connected to based on the identification data [p0074, p0075].

Regarding claim 7, the rationale applied to the rejection of claim 1 has been incorporated herein. Sashihara further teaches: A log-in method in accordance with claim 1, wherein the first network is constituted as the Internet [p0054, p0055, p0074, fig. 3: S7, A, fig. 4: S14, S15, S20, S21, S22] and the second network is constituted as a local area network [fig. 3: S5, S11, S12, p0061-p0063].

Regarding claim 8, the rationale applied to the rejection of claim 7 has been incorporated herein. Sashihara further teaches: A log-in method in accordance with claim 7, wherein the identification data are constituted as an IP address and the server is constituted so as to refer to an address list in which at least IP addresses of client computers connected to the local area network are registered, judge that when the IP address is registered in the address list, a client computer having the IP address is

connected to the local area network and judge that when the IP address is not registered in the address list, a client computer having the IP address is connected to the Internet [fig. 3: S3-S12, fig. 4, p0061-p0064, p0070-p0074].

Regarding claim 9, the rationale applied to the rejection of claim 7 has been incorporated herein. Sashihara further teaches: A log-in method in accordance with claim 7, wherein the identification data are constituted as an IP address and the server is constituted so as to judge that when the IP address is a global IP address, a client computer having the IP address is connected to the Internet and judge that when the IP address is a local IP address, a client computer having the IP address is connected to the local area network [fig. 3: S3-S12, fig. 4, p0061-p0064, p0070-p0074].

Claims 10 and 11 have been analyzed and rejected with regard to claim 1 and in accordance with Sato's further teaching on: A computer program for enabling a server in a client server system and a computer-readable recording medium in which is recorded a computer program [p0087, p0088].

5. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato (US Pub: 2003/0009695) and Sashihara (US Pub: 2002/0157007); and in further view of Reese et al (US Patent: 7,076,539).

Regarding claim 2, the rationale applied to the rejection of claim 1 has been incorporated herein. Since user ID and password for log-in are required in both Sato

and Sashihara's teaching, there is no significant difference between the two log-in formats. In the same field of endeavor, Reese et al teach: A log-in method in accordance with claim 1, wherein the second log-in screen is constituted so that it can be used more easily than the first log-in screen [figs. 5-7]. Reese et al illustrate various ways for log-in. Therefore, it would have been obvious for an ordinary skilled in the art to modify the combined teaching of Sato and Sashihara to implement different log-in methods as disclosed by Reese et al for clients from different networks for differentiating convenience provided on various security levels.

6. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato (US Pub: 2003/0009695) and Sashihara (US Pub: 2002/0157007); and in further view of Snapper et al (US Patent: 7,216,292).

Regarding claims 3 and 4, the rationale applied to the rejection of claim 1 has been incorporated herein. Sato teaches: A log-in method in accordance with claim 1, wherein the first log-in screen is adapted to be directly input with both a log-in name and a password of a user [p0066]. Sato and Sashihara do not teach selecting a log-in name from a list. In the same field of endeavor, Snapper et al teach: the second log-in screen is constituted so as to require a user to select a log-in name of the user and directly input a password of the user; and the second log-in screen is constituted so as to require a user to select a log-in name of the user in accordance with an auto-complete format and to directly input a password of the user [figs 4A-4D, col 9: lines 56-67, col

10: lines 1-29].

7. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato (US Pub: 2003/0009695) and Sashihara (US Pub: 2002/0157007); and in further view of Rasmussen et al (US Patent: 6,834,795).

Regarding claim 5, the rationale applied to the rejection of claim 1 has been incorporated herein. Sato and Sashihara do not specify any significant difference in log-in format for indication of level of access restriction although Sato does prohibit accessing when source IP does not match a pre-defined one as shown in fig. 3: S108. In the same field of endeavor, Rasmussen et al teach: A log-in method in accordance with claim 1, wherein the level of access restriction to the second log-in screen is determined to be higher than that to the first log-in screen [col 4: lines 57-65, fig. 5]. Having different log-in screens for different security access levels has been well practiced in the art as prescribed by Rasmussen et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious for an ordinary skilled in the art to modify the combined teaching of Sato and Sashihara to implement different log-in screens for authenticating user accessed from various networks for the purpose of differentiating security levels.

Contact

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fan Zhang whose telephone number is (571) 270-3751. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark K. Zimmerman can be reached on (571) 272-7653. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Fan Zhang/

Patent Examiner

/Mark K Zimmerman/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625